

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**SIOBAUGHN NICHOLS,  
APPELLANT  
vs.**

**DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,  
RESPONDENT**

---

DOCKET NUMBER WD75412

DATE: JUNE 4, 2013

---

Appeal from:

The Labor and Industrial Relations Commission

---

Appellate Judges:

Division Four: James E. Welsh, Chief Judge, Victor C. Howard, Judge and Mark D. Pfeiffer,  
Judge

---

Attorneys:

Siobaughn Nichols, Appellant Pro-se

Sara H. Harrison, for Respondent

---

**MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY**

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**SIOBAUGHN NICHOLS, APPELANT**

**v.**

**DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, RESPONDENT**

WD75412

Labor and Industrial Relations

Before Division Four: James E. Welsh, Chief Judge, Victor C. Howard, Judge and Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge

Siobaughn Nichols filed a claim for unemployment benefits after she was discharged from her employment with the Liberty School District. A deputy for the Division of Employment Security determined that Nichols was disqualified from receiving benefits because she was discharged for misconduct connected with work. Nichols filed an appeal with the Appeals Tribunal, which heard the matter and held that Nichols was disqualified from unemployment benefits because of misconduct connected with her work. Nichols appealed to the Commission, which affirmed the decision of the Appeals Tribunal. Nichols appeals.

**DISMISSED.**

**Division Four holds:**

Nichols asserts in her brief on appeal that the Commission erred in denying her benefits because “the decision was based on appellant being discharged for misconduct[,] the employer is required to prove intent [for] its case for misconduct[,] appellant was discharged for violation of work rules pertaining to time keeping and employee breaks[,] violation of work rule is not the dispositive proof of misconduct connected with work[,] the decision runs contrary with Missouri laws there[fore] appellant should not [have] been denied unemployment benefits.” However, Nichols’s brief contains significant deficiencies and does not comply with Rule 84.04, preserving nothing for appellate review. Accordingly, Nichols’s appeal is dismissed.

**Opinion by: Victor C. Howard, Judge**

Date: June 4, 2013

<p><b>This summary is <i>UNOFFICIAL</i> and should not be quoted or cited.</b></p>
--